



PATENT
450100-4392

REMARKS

The Office Action in the above-identified application has been carefully considered and the following remarks are presented to place this application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-30 are in the present application. No amendments are made thereto. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims are in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 31-33 were withdrawn from consideration in response to a restriction requirement.

RECEIVED

MAR 21 2002

Technology Center 2600

Claims 1-8, 13, 14, 17, 19-23, 29, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawthorne (U.S. Patent 4,672,436) in view of McNelley et al. (U.S. Patent 5,550,754). However, the present invention is distinguishable over Hawthorne and McNelley for at least the following reasons.

The present invention has “display-ready video signal generating means for generating a display-ready video signal based on the image pickup signal reproduced from said recording medium by said recording and reproducing means and said image information.” (Claims 1 and 20) The Examiner asserts that Hawthorne inherently shows a display-ready video signal generating means in the camcorder 22. (Office Action page 3) However, Applicants are unable to locate in Hawthorne any discussion of generating a display-ready video signal, especially as reproduced from a recording medium. Therefore, Applicants’ respectfully request the Examiner

indicate why he believes Hawthorne inherently shows a display-ready video signal generating means.

Regarding claims 7 and 22, the Examiner asserts McNelley et al. discloses a graphic user interface analogous to the present invention's "graphic user interface capability." (Office Action page 4). The present invention combines the display-ready video signal with the GUI, as shown in Figures 30-43, using the graphic controller 58 in the video camera. This combined GUI video data is then sent to the display device. By contrast, McNelley does not disclose transmitting (sending) the video data combined with the GUI data. (Column 4, Lines 31-40)

Further, the present invention's commander has "command information storing means for storing a plurality of kinds of command information." (Claim 1) Whereas, McNelley does not disclose a memory (storage means) in the handset. (Column 7, Lines 39-65)

Also, regarding claim 11, the present invention's commander has "moving state detecting means for detecting movements of the commander brought about by the user." (Claim 11) This moving state detecting means corresponds to the embedded piezoelectric ceramic elements which detect the Coriolis force. (Figures 21 and 23; Specification page 63) The Examiner concedes that "Hawthorne and McNelley et al. fail to specifically disclose moving state detecting means.... However, it is well known in the art to include a detector into the system to detect the movement of the commander." (Office Action page 6) Applicants respectfully disagree and believe the present invention's use of the moving state detecting means in a remote control for directing a pointer in a remote display is not well known in the art.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Hawthorne and McNelley fail to obviate the present invention and the rejected claims should be allowed.

Claims 9–12 and 24–26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawthorne in view of McNelley and further in view of Blades et al. (U.S. Patent 5,990,888). The Examiner relies upon Blades solely to meet the pointer limitation in dependent claims 9 and 24. Regarding claims 12 and 26, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that Figures 3A-3G disclose moving “said pointer unidirectionally” as claimed. Moreover, since claims 9, 10, 12, and 24–26 depend from independent claims 1 and 20, the claims should be allowed in view of the foregoing discussion.

Claims 15–16 and 27–28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawthorne in view of McNelley and further in view of Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,249,316). The Examiner relies upon Anderson solely to meet the edit, image pickup, standby, and recording mode limitations in dependent claims 15–16 and 27–28. However, since claims 15–16 and 27–28 depend from independent claims 1 and 20, the claims should be allowed in view of the foregoing discussion.

Claims 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawthorne in view of McNelley and further in view of Nakamura et al. (U.S. Patent 5,008,756). The Examiner relies upon Nakamura solely to meet the display device microphone limitation in dependent claims 18. However, since claim 18 depends from independent claim 1, claim 18 should be allowed in view of the foregoing discussion.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application as now presented is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

No additional fees are deemed to be required for the filing of this amendment, but if such are, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 

Darren M. Simon
Reg. No. 47,946
(212) 588-0800